DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 825 80 EA 009 062

AUTHOR Guthrie, James W.
TITLE The Imperative of Leadership. Volume II, Number 7. A Report on Alternative Methods of Teacher Certification.
INSTITUTION National Association of State Boards of Education, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE Jan 77
NOTE 16p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of State Boards of Education, 810 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295 ($1.25)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Role; Credentials; Educational Policy; *State Boards of Education; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title V; ESEA Title V

ABSTRACT

This booklet is one of a series of reports addressing the most critical issues confronting state boards of education throughout the United States. Each report attempts to present a concise, informative review and analysis of the best and most current information available on one of these critical topics. This booklet focuses on the educational policy implications of alternative methods of teacher training and certification. Section 1 contains a brief overview and summary of the booklet; section 2 presents a review and analysis of the present teacher credentialing and training system and discusses four other credentialing alternatives by James W. Guthrie; section 3 presents a number of action alternatives recommended by the staff of the National Association of State Boards of Education; and section 4 contains footnotes and a brief annotated bibliography prepared by the author of section 2. (JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED133825.

THE IMPERATIVE OF LEADERSHIP

Volume II, Number 7

A REPORT ON ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION

NASBE

EA 009 062

CONTENTS

PREFACE 1

SECTION I — Overview Summary 1

SECTION II — Alternative Methods of Teacher Certification 3

The Present Credentialing and Training System 3

Credentialing Alternatives 5

SECTION III — Action Alternatives 12

SECTION IV — Appendix 13

Footnotes and Annotated Bibliography 13

This report represents Volume II, No. 7 in NASBE's *Imperative of Leadership* series, made available with funds provided by ESEA, P.L. 89-10, Title V, Section 505 through the State of New York. Volume I contained the following reports sent free-of-charge to all NASBE members: *Educational Governance* (No. 1); *Reforming School Finance* (No. 2); *Strengthening and Improving Relationships Between State Boards of Education and Legislators* (No. 3); *Accountability and Assessment* (No. 4); *The Education of Disadvantaged and Minority Children: A Multicultural Perspective* (No. 5); *The Planning, Improvement and Governance of Vocational and Vocational-Technical Education* (No. 6).

Volume II contains to date: *Declining Enrollments* (No. 1); *Developing Consistent and Cooperative Constituency Linkages* (No. 2); *Developing Board Agendas That Focus on Policy* (No. 3); *Developing Effective and Visible State Boards of Education* (No. 4); *Community Education* (No. 5); and *Career Education* (No. 6).

Volume II, No. 1, on *Declining Enrollments* was published with funds provided by the National Institute of Education (NIE). Volume II, No. 8, on *Preventive Health Education* will be funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Center for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia.

Single Copy, Vol. I, Nos. 1-6 ..... $1.00
Single Copy, Vol. II, Nos. 2-8 ..... $1.25

Order copies from NASBE, 810 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295, (303) 861-0911.

PREFACE

This report on *Alternative Methods of Teacher Certification* is seventh in a second volume of reports on timely issues of concern to State Boards of Education. Publication of these *Imperative of Leadership* reports is made available to all NASBE members with funds provided by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA, Public Law 89-10, Title V, Section 505), through the State of New York.

The first report in this volume, on *Declining Enrollments*, was published with funds provided by the National Institute of Education (NIE). Other reports on the following topics have been published in this series of issue packages:

- **Developing Consistent and Cooperative Constituency Linkages**
- **Developing Effective and Visible State Boards of Education**
- **Developing Board Agendas That Focus on Policy**
- **Community Education**
- **Career Education**

An eighth issue package on *Preventive Health Education* will be published early next year, and is being funded through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Center for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia.

The report that follows is organized into four sections. Section I presents a condensed *Overview Summary* of the research text contained in Section II. Section III, the *Action Alternatives*, contains recommendations developed by the NASBE staff. Section IV is an *Appendix*, consisting of Footnotes and an Annotated Bibliography.

NASBE wishes to express its appreciation to Dr. James W. Guthrie, Associate Professor, School of Education, University of California, who wrote the research text.

Grant L. Anderson
NASBE President

January 1977
Denver, Colorado

SECTION I

Overview Summary

Credentialing procedures should serve to assure at least adequately qualified teachers; the most proficient licensing system also will function to improve the quality of teaching and to enhance the productivity of schools.

Although subject to change (due presumably to a lack of any uniform teacher standards nationwide), training and credentialing systems usually require, at a minimum, that a teacher have a Bachelor's degree. But, in a review of the present system, Dr. Guthrie contends that it is lacking sufficient control to safeguard standards for educational quality. He suggests that a license to teach and tenure are too easily granted, and control after that point is even less watchful. "The state usually acts as a disinterested party or referee, seeing only that the credential candidate has the correct number of required courses on his or her transcript," Guthrie writes.

Evaluation techniques inadequate to the task are at fault for this seeming lack of judicious management. The deficit is reflected in the standard procedures for teacher salary increments. Dr. Guthrie writes that the two primary determinants of a teacher's pay are *number of years experience* and *amount of schooling* beyond the Bachelor's level. A complicating factor is that salary scales for teachers are designed now to encourage teachers to aspire to administrative responsibilities—in other words, to not teach.

Given these and other problems with teacher training and licensing procedures, it seems apparent that some system is required to maintain at least minimum teacher standards. Dr. Guthrie presents these four alternatives:

- **Why credential at all?** Since nonpublic schools usually are not subject to the constraints of state credential requirements, an argument is extended that perhaps the public school also ought not to be. Some contend that restrictive licensing requirements stifle teacher creativity; or, perhaps because teaching is not "irrevocable" (a child can survive several months of poor instruction), control over credentialing may not be necessary at all.
- **Public control.** Guthrie cites four reasons in support of public control: (1) so that societal mores may be properly transmitted; (2) to assure that the public school monopoly operates in the public's interest; (3) because the lay public is more sensitive to changes in the public's tastes; (4) to more safely assure licensing requirements that are even and equitable nationwide.
- **Professional control.** Because teaching involves expert knowledge and technical practices usually not understood by the lay public, so the argument goes, only a fellow teacher is capable of judging another teacher's competence. That teachers are involved also in training future teachers serves to strengthen this argument.
- **A combined public/professional system.** Under this system, professionals would control preservice teacher training which, Guthrie contends, should take place on a graduate level of study. Thereafter, Guthrie suggests, states should revise credentialing procedures in order to establish the following teacher categories:

Intern Teacher—has successfully completed a two-year graduate program. Interns would be supervised and carry less than a full day's workload.

Classroom Teacher—has taught in regular classes after working as an Intern for two years.

Special Teacher—has worked at least four years as a Classroom teacher, completed one additional year of graduate work and passed a state's teacher licensing commission procedures. To draw special teacher pay, he/she would have to work with a group of students designated as "special."

Master Teacher—holds a doctorate, has successfully worked as an Intern, Classroom and Special teacher, and has passed a state teacher licensing commission evaluation. Pay for this category, in which an average of only 10 per cent of teachers would fall, is commensurate with school principals.

Dr. Guthrie proposes that primary responsibility for establishing and overseeing teacher evaluation should rest with a state level teacher licensing commission, authorized by the State Board of Education. Such a commission would have 12 members, six of whom would be appointed by the State Board of Education. The remaining six would be jointly appointed by the governor and state legislature.

Evaluation and promotion authority would belong to this state commission through regional review boards. Appeals to decisions of the review boards would be through the state commission. Guthrie's revised evaluation system provides for input from the individual teacher in the form of a "professional portfolio" of the teacher's instructional and/or research endeavors.

A credentialing model like this, Dr. Guthrie cautions, with revised and more stringent standards for teacher training, will undoubtedly cost more money and "provoke opposition" from some. □

SECTION II

Alternative Methods of Teacher Certification

By James W. Guthrie, Associate Professor, Policy Studies, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Who should be responsible for assuring the public that the educational professionals who serve them are adequately qualified? Should licensing of educational professionals be controlled by representatives of the general public or by members of the teaching profession? What governmental arrangements best permit a balance of public and professional interests over teacher licensing? Can certification serve both to improve the quality of teaching and to enhance the productivity of schools? These are the questions to which this paper is directed.

The Purpose of Credentials

Antecedents of modern credentialing can be found with medieval guilds. In the 17th century, educational entrepreneurs in England had to obtain a government certificate of religious orthodoxy before opening a school. In colonial and early 19th century America, this practice was adapted as a test of the local schoolmaster candidate's character and spiritual integrity. In the latter part of the 19th century, as science and expertise displaced religion as a dominant cultural ethos, teacher certification became tied to amount of formal education.

The general argument for state licensing of teachers runs as follows. States have compulsory school attendance laws. If schooling is mandatory, then the state has an obligation to ensure that school personnel are at least minimally competent professionally and possessed of moral integrity. In order to provide such assurance, states establish certification machinery. Usually state education departments are authorized to issue teaching credentials to individuals who have no prior arrest record and who have met specified teacher training standards.

THE PRESENT CREDENTIALING AND TRAINING SYSTEM

Teacher training and credentialing are subject to stylish fads. Periodically legislatures in various states permit persons to teach who have only a Bachelor's degree, without additional teaching "methods" course work. In other states at other times, graduate work may be necessary for a teaching credential (as for example, in California). Seldom, however, does this involve more than a year of study beyond the Bachelor's level. Education majors usually are required to have a number of courses in pedagogy and a period of practice teaching ranging from one semester to two years, depending on the institution and state involved. Schools of education usually are permitted to establish their own admission and graduation

standards. Relative to other professional schools, such standards are generally low. The result is that teachers, with some splendid exceptions, do not match the academic qualifications of individuals in professions such as law, engineering, medicine or public administration.[1]

Credentialing. The body of knowledge and repertoire of skills one is expected to master during teacher training is seldom made clear, but it is particularly vague in the area of practice teaching. Assignment of student teachers to their mentors in the field is haphazard at best, and the supervision given a student teacher varies remarkably, from day-to-day surveillance by an expert and experienced instructional craftsman to total, "sink-or-swim," unsupervised freedom. The state usually acts as a disinterested party or referee, seeing only that the credential candidate has the correct number of required courses recorded on his or her transcript. States delegate much of the determination of course content and supervision of credential candidates to schools of education.

Employment. Once receiving a teaching credential, the traditional pattern of teacher behavior is to find initial employment either in a rural area or in a central city school system. The obvious consequence is to burden such districts with an inequitable proportion of inexperienced teachers.[2] (A sustained period of economic duress and teacher surplus may alter this pattern; as of 1977, however, there is insufficient information to judge.) Once hired in such circumstances, an ambitious and upwardly mobile teacher aims for one or a combination of goals, transfer to a "better" school or school district, tenure and promotion.

Tenure. This status is frequently misunderstood. It is a legal classification noting that a teacher cannot be dismissed without "cause." Cause is typically defined as constituting incompetence or moral turpitude. In most states, tenure status is granted upon completion of three years of successful classroom teaching. During the trial period, the teacher presumably can be dismissed simply as a consequence of an administrative decision. However, this is becoming more complicated as court cases and dismissal hearings increasingly assert that due process applies even in attempts to oust a probationary teacher, and a case must be made that the non-tenured teacher's efforts were systematically evaluated and found wanting.[3]

Evaluation. For practical purposes, little of the foregoing description matters. The overwhelming majority of teachers hired by school districts do gain tenure—if not in the district where initially employed, then in their subsequent position. Once granted tenure, the proportion of teachers dismissed for any reason is miniscule.

One might reasonably ask, "How can that be? Certainly there are incompetent or immoral teachers." The obvious answer is Yes, though the proportion of such individuals is probably no greater among teachers than in any other employee group. Nevertheless, given that some percentage of teachers do not perform their jobs well, why are they not dismissed?

The problem is typically one of evaluation. *How can you tell if a teacher is performing well?* What yardstick applies? There are probably as many opinions of good and bad teaching as there have ever been students. Administrators argue that, even when they know how to evaluate teachers, they are so burdened with paper work and other duties that they seldom have time to assess classroom performance of teachers. In the face of such overwhelming disagreement and confusion, and in the absence of glaring evidence to the contrary, the typical administrative judgment is that the "teaching is adequate" and the individual involved is promoted. Once promoted to tenure, teacher dismissal becomes harder by many times over.

Promotion and Pay. "Getting ahead" is as important to teachers as it is to most workers. However, an educator's elevation to higher levels of pay is not tightly linked to performance. The two primary determinants of a teacher's pay are *number of years of experience* and *amount of schooling* beyond the Bachelor's degree. Of the two, experience is typically rewarded more highly by school district salary schedules. There are automatic or built-in teacher pay increases that leave

little room for administrator discretion or judgment regarding quality of performance. In the absence of acceptable objective measures, teachers fear administrator judgments will be overly subjective and open to favoritism. The outcome has been a teacher pay and promotion system that is politically sanitized, chronologically automatic and relatively insulated from any assessment of individual instructional performance.

Upward Mobility and Implicit Rewards. Even when a teacher achieves the top rungs of a district's salary schedule, the pay is not likely to be high relative to remuneration available at the top of other career ladders. Consequently, ambitious teachers are often provoked into altering their careers, either by leaving education altogether or in some other fashion. The most frequently pursued promotion strategy is to strive for a school administrative position. The pattern is to assume other duties, such as those of a demonstration teacher, department chairman, guidance counselor, vice principal, central office supervisor or director, assistant superintendent and then superintendent, state education department official or college instructor. Each of these sequential steps generally accords its incumbent substantially higher pay or prestige. Thus, our educational system conveys its highest rewards, financial and otherwise, to those who are most distant from children and classroom teaching. In short, if you want to be a success in education, get out of teaching.

Inservice Training. Many professions depend heavily for success upon their employees keeping abreast of new developments. Education is no exception. Incentives are strong for teachers to continue their education and training. The U.S. spends $1 billion to $2 billion dollars annually on the inservice training of teachers. *The difficulty is that states and local school districts have forfeited control.* Inservice education is almost completely at the discretion of individual teachers. In most instances, pay scales provide salary increments simply when higher college course credit plateaus have been achieved. The nature of courses, degree to which they are related to a teacher's instructional duties or subject matter specialization, and their ability to buttress weaknesses uncovered in a systematic performance evaluation are almost nil. Inservice training or continued education could be rendered vastly more effective if means could be found for overcoming these weaknesses.

CREDENTIALING ALTERNATIVES

Why Credential At All?. The First Alternative

State credential requirements usually apply only to public school personnel. The fact that nonpublic schools typically are free to employ whomever they wish is something of an inconsistency. One out of every 11 students in the U.S. attends a nonpublic school. Despite the frequent absence of licensing protection, private school students do not appear disproportionately to be victims of incompetent and immoral instruction. On the contrary, in that they attend such schools by choice, it would appear that their parents are more satisfied with the private than with the public school sector.

It might reasonably be argued, however, that public licensing provisions provide a basis for comparison, and that competition encourages private institutions to comply with minimal personnel standards even though they are not legally obligated to do so. To whatever degree this is correct, licensing may be a necessary and

useful function for the state to perform. If the foregoing reasoning proves invalid, one can speculate as to whether or not teacher licensing is necessary to ensure the quality of schooling.

Critics frequently contend that credential requirements are too restrictive and discourage truly creative individuals from plying the teaching craft. After all, the argument goes, schooling is not like flying a plane, having brain surgery or building a bridge—all endeavors that involve irrevocable decisions and actions. A child may encounter a few days, weeks or even months of poor instruction and still survive. Perhaps all that is necessary is to assure parents that their child's instructor is moral and sane. It may be that control over credentialing, neither public nor professional, is the appropriate question. Rather, we should inquire, why credential at all?

The Case For Public Control: The Second Alternative

There appear to be at least four major justifications for maintaining close public control over the teacher licensing process.

- **Transmission of values.** Schools, along with other social institutions such as the family, are looked to by society as a prime engine for conveying values from one generation to the next. Honesty, fair play, respect for authority, adherence to majority rule—are all examples of attitudes schools are expected to promote. Given this sensitive function, it is crucial to the public that they have control over the kinds of individuals permitted to instruct students. The absence of such control runs the risk that the values being transmitted will become perverted and inconsistent with the public's desires.
- **Monopoly Regulation.** A second argument favoring public control over teacher licensing is an offshoot of the concern for values. In the United States, public schools are a virtual monopoly. It is generally agreed that monopolies, where permitted to exist at all, must be subjected to public regulation to ensure that they are operating in the public's interest. For example, phone companies, utilities and, in certain instances, transportation companies are granted the right to provide a service free of competition. However such a right is generally attended with a substantial degree of public regulation. Schools, it is argued, should be no exception, and the most important part of school are the people who teach. Hence, the public must exercise a measure of control regarding the calibre of persons permitted to instruct.
- **Responsiveness.** Third, given the need for licensing, the case for public control contends that only lay licensing bodies will be sufficiently sensitive to changes in the public's tastes to modify credentialing requirements. For example, America's educational system was able to respond to Sputnik-induced school reforms because publicly controlled policy bodies, such as teacher licensing boards, were in touch with the public's pulse. The professionally controlled body might have been substantially slower to act, and, consequently, citizen faith in and support of schools would have diminished.
- **Uniform Standards.** A fourth argument for publicly controlled licensing stems from the inadequacies and unevenness of teacher training institutions in this country. In that schools of education are established to prepare a cadre of professional instructors, could they not be entrusted with the responsibility to credential teachers? Critics argue no and point to the vast inconsistency in standards and approaches among schools of education. While such diversity may have benefits for guaranteeing a wider array of training philosophies and techniques, it discourages enforcement of uniform minimal standards.

The Case For Professional Control: The Third Alternative

Advocates for professional control over licensing contend that teaching requires mastery of a body of expert knowledge and technical practices usually not fully understood by the majority of lay people. In fact, the argument runs, only a fellow teacher, trained and experienced in pedagogy, is capable of determining another instructor's competence. An analogy is made to other professions, for example, medicine. How many lay people could adequately assess whether surgeons or anesthetists were employing appropriate techniques. The validity of this argument rests in part on the degree to which one concedes that teaching depends on a scientific body of knowledge and practices.

Related to the previous justification is the contention that other professional groups and many "nonprofessional" workers (for example, plumbers, sheet metal workers and pipefitters) control entry into their vocations. Therefore, why should teachers be denied such a right? To do so is demeaning and it undermines teachers' legitimate claims on being professional. If bar associations license lawyers and medical societies control the practice of medicine, the argument goes, then why cannot teacher organizations determine who is eligible to instruct students?

Yet another argument in favor of teacher control over teacher licensing stems from the fact that teachers are frequently engaged in the training of prospective teachers. Absence of professional control over licensing handicaps articulation between preservice teacher training and practice teaching. One body, namely professional teachers, should be responsible for overseeing a consistent transition from teacher recruitment, through preservice instruction, to standard classroom practice. Only in this way, it is argued, can the gap be closed between theory and practice.

Lastly, aside from advantages such as the cooperation between trainers and practitioners described above, those who advocate professional control over licensing contend that it would not terminate public control. Final authority for granting and revoking credentials could continue to reside with state legislatures. If they should become dissatisfied with the manner in which professional educators are governing their peers, they retain final authority to revise the situation.

A Public and Professional System: A Proposed Fourth Alternative

Many of the problems of teacher effectiveness described earlier are triggered by conditions, the discussion of which is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, aside from the desirability for many other basic reforms in school governance, there exist provident steps which can be taken now to alter teacher certification, thereby encouraging greater teacher effectiveness and promoting professionalism in education. What follows here is in the nature of a recommendation for State Board of Education action.

Preservice Teacher Training. Both for elementary and secondary school personnel, teacher training should take place exclusively at the graduate level. Following completion of requirements for a Bachelor's degree, an individual would be eligible to apply for admission to a department of education where teacher training then would occupy two years of graduate study. A successful candidate under these conditions emerges with a Master of Arts degree in Teaching (MAT). For secondary teachers this would include a year of graduate study in a subject matter field. The expertise necessary to be an able teacher of history, English, foreign language or any other subject specialization is seldom acquired during the undergraduate years. Student respect for beginning teachers and

teachers' self respect would be substantially enhanced if subject matter competence were better assured than is presently the case.

Elementary teachers should specialize also primarily in teaching of reading and mathematics. In addition, they need an intensive understanding of child development processes. Beyond their graduate year of specialization, both elementary and secondary teacher trainees should spend an additional year in courses in pedagogy and practice teaching. The latter should take place under the tutelage not only of a supervisor from a collegiate training institution but also under the auspices of a "Master Teacher" (see below) in the public school setting. An important component of the two-year teacher training program would be the trainee's initial compilation of a "Professional Portfolio" to serve subsequently as the primary instrument for teacher evaluation (*Teacher Licensing*.[4]) States should move to revise credentialing procedures in favor of four major categories: (1) Intern Teacher, (2) Classroom Teacher, (3) Special Teacher and (4) Master Teacher. Each of these categories would represent added levels of training, experience and competence. Moreover, transition from one level to the next would require successfully accomplishing a number of evaluation procedures. Lastly, each successive credential category would be associated with significantly higher state-mandated minimum salary scales. The evaluation and remuneration parts of this plan are described in subsequent sections. Here we describe the different functions of each credential category:

- *Intern Teacher*. This credential category would be open to individuals successfully completing a two-year graduate program in teacher education. "Success" would, among other things, be gauged heavily by academic performance over two years and high ratings in practice teaching. On being awarded Intern Teacher status, an individual would remain under supervision of a Master Teacher for yet another two years. Presumably, Intern Teachers would carry the equivalent of what presently is defined as a one-half to two-third's regular teaching load. They would be practicing and developing a repertoire of pedagogical techniques suitable to their instructional responsibilities. Throughout this endeavor they would be subject to the systematic supervision and criticism of a licensed Master Teacher. Also, an Intern Teacher would be planning and conducting simplified classroom research projects and continuing to accumulate materials useful for a professional portfolio. Individuals judged to be unsuitable for advancement to the next credential category would be screened out at this level.

- *Classroom Teacher*. This credential category would be accessible to individuals successfully completing at least two years of intern teaching. After navigating the evaluation process covering transition from one credential category to the next, a teacher would be eligible for regular classroom instructional responsibilities at either the elementary or secondary level. Presumably this would be defined as a full teaching load. It is hoped, however, that because of greater emphasis on professionalism and better preservice preparation, a Classroom Teacher would also have responsibilities for conducting research and serving on personnel panels to evaluate fellow teachers and administrators.

- *Special Teacher*. This credential category would be open to those who had amassed a minimum of four years of successful teaching as a Classroom Teacher, had completed a minimum of one additional year of graduate study, and had passed state teacher licensing commission procedures for this credential level. Special Teachers would be assigned to several instructional settings requiring added knowledge and expertise, for example, teaching physically and mentally handicapped children and under-achieving students in low income rural or big city schools. Simply possessing the training and credential required to be a Special Teacher would not suffice to draw special teacher's pay. In addition, the individual must actually perform in a teaching assignment with a group of students designated as "special." It is not envisioned that such assignments would be found in schools filled with "normal" children from comfortable economic circumstances.

• *Master Teacher.* This category would be reserved for no more than 10 per cent of all employed teachers in a state. To be accorded Master Teacher status, an individual would have to hold an earned doctorate, have successfully served as an Intern, Classroom and Special Teacher, and passed the state teacher licensing commission evaluation. Master Teachers would have instructional and supervisory duties to perform. The latter would consist primarily of overseeing the practice teaching of trainees and the work of Intern Teachers.

Master Teachers, as the title implies, would represent the apex of instructional capability, control of a subject matter area or skill speciality, knowledge of pedagogical practices and how to conduct research about them and a record of outstanding performance as a teacher. Master Teachers should be professionals in every sense of the word. They should enjoy the status, autonomy and pay of a professional. In regard to the latter, Master Teachers should be on the same pay schedule as school principals in a local district.

Teacher Evaluation and Promotion. Evaluation procedures are at the heart of any system designed to improve teacher performance. Such procedures must satisfy at least the following criteria: (1) be based in substantial measure on valid and reliable information; (2) permit a degree of participation by the party to be evaluated, in at least the establishment of evaluation ground rules; (3) judgment by peers; and (4) a means for providing feedback to the individual being evaluated. The following arrangements would satisfy these conditions:

State Teacher Licensing Commission. Primary responsibility for establishing and overseeing teacher evaluation regulations should rest with a special State Board of Education-authorized teacher licensing commission. This statewide body would be authorized to assess eligibility for the four credential levels described above. (Progress through the various steps *within* any one credential category would be the primary responsibility of the local board of education in the school district in which the teacher was employed.)

The Licensing Commission should be composed of 12 members: two representatives from teacher training institutions, two Master Teachers and two superintendents. These six should be appointed by the State Board of Education, with the assistance of the chief state school officer. Three local school board members and three citizens should be appointed jointly by the governor and state legislature. In order to retain public confidence it is important that there be a balance between professional and lay members. State Boards of Education will have to ensure such a balance in the face of intense pressure from education organizations to gain a dominant position.

Terms of office for commission members should be no less than two years and no more than four, and they should be staggered so as to assure continuity of experience. The licensing commission should be provided with a legislative appropriation to cover operating expenses and the cost of a small staff. It would appoint, annually or biannually, regional review boards throughout the state. These units would take responsibility for assessing the qualifications of teachers who are applying for promotion from one credential category to another, for example, from Intern to Classroom Teacher.

Evaluation Procedures. Upon completing the prescribed years of service and other qualification criteria for a particular credential category, a candidate for promotion would apply to the state teacher licensing commission to be evaluated. Applications would be delegated to the appropriate regional review board. Each such board would be a microcosm of its parent, containing a Master Teacher, college faculty member, superintendent, local school board member and a citizen. Each regional board would convene annually. State commission staff would have prepared materials necessary for board deliberations and would have scheduled interviews, where appropriate, with promotion candidates. In addition to the

professional portfolio, described below, the regional board would have the prerogative of interviewing candidates and of talking with students, parents, teaching colleagues and supervisors.

Regional boards should communicate their decisions to the state commission by early spring of the same year, and candidates would be informed of credential promotion decisions simultaneously. Appeals of negative decisions would flow directly to the state commission which would have the right to reverse regional board judgments. A positive judgment would accord a candidate the appropriate credential. Thereafter, the individual would be eligible for any school district opening in the specified credential category. School districts would choose from the statewide pool of those eligible. Upon being employed to perform a job at a specific credential level, a teacher would receive remuneration consistent with the entry step in that category. In other words, it would be possible to have a larger pool of eligible special teachers than there existed Special Teacher positions. Only those actually employed in such positions would draw commensurate pay. This point is important, particularly in the instance of Master Teachers wherein, by definition, only 10 per cent of a state's public school instructors can assume such rank.

Professional Portfolio. A significant share of teacher evaluation should reside with teachers themselves. Toward this end, the state teacher licensing commission and its regional subunits should be composed, in part, of teachers. Beyond that, individual teachers should exercise initiative in the evaluation process by assembling basic evidence upon which annual district level, as well as periodic state level, credential evaluation would be based. The keystone of an individual teacher's record should be a "Professional Portfolio" consisting of such items as the following:

1. A description of and academic transcripts from an individual's undergraduate, graduate, and professional course work.
2. A record of scores on statewide tests of the students who have been in the teacher's charge. (This implies a need for a statewide testing program.)
3. Questionnaires submitted each year to parents and, above the eighth grade, to students.
4. Video tape records of observations and special instructional activities of the teachers.
5. Letters of evaluation from Master Teachers under whom one has taught over time, and from administrators and college supervisors.
6. Evidence of classroom research studies.
7. Examples of a teacher's professional activities. This might include a new curriculum unit, a published article or a proposal to a foundation.
8. Other items of the teacher's choosing, which he or she believes illustrate instructional prowess.

These are the items that would provide the primary grist for teacher evaluation. However, as already stated, regional review boards and the state commission could collect additional information wherever needed. For example, it might prove important for the commission to solicit additional evaluation data from supervising Master Teachers.

Local School District Role

Evaluation of teachers' performances clearly must take place more regularly than will occur during the periodic assessments proposed to be conducted under state teacher licensing commission auspices. During those times between reviews for credential promotion purposes, local officials must assume evaluation responsibility. This should be done every two years and in a manner consistent with state level procedures. For example, a local district panel composed of a Master Teacher, principal, parent, and, above the eighth grade, a student. Again, a

teacher's Professional Portfolio should serve as the primary basis for such an evaluation.

There should be at least two important outcomes stemming from biennial local evaluation sessions. First, the individual teacher should be provided with feedback. This performance report and state specified qualifications for credential promotion should serve as primary guideposts for teachers' inservice education efforts. Second, evaluation results should determine a teacher's placement on the district salary schedule for the credential category involved.

A *Caveat*

The foregoing proposal contains the potential to alter teacher recruitment, training, credentialing, employment, evaluation and promotion procedures dramatically. Consequently, as might be expected, they will provoke opposition from a number of parties who perceive their self-interests to be jeopardized. For example, teacher organizations have long opposed "merit pay" schemes on grounds that the evaluation procedures did not guarantee sufficient objectivity. The multilevel credential system proposed here attempts to avoid such pitfalls by paying teachers additional amounts not simply for "merit," but also for expanded duties and responsibilities.

Also, teachers have frequently opposed the use of standardized test results for professional evaluation purposes. Their opposition has hinged primarily on the contention that they do not have sufficient control over a student's environment to be held responsible for precise learning outcomes. There is a measure of validity to this position and, thus, students' scores must be interpreted carefully during an assessment of a teacher's performance. However, in that tests assess the *sina qua non* of schooling, e.g., progress in reading and mathematics, policy makers must insist on retaining them as one instrument for calibrating teacher effectiveness.

Implementation of the proposals will entail economic as well as political costs. For example, requiring two years of preservice teacher training will necessitate a substantial "retooling" on the part of teacher training institutions. Faculty enthusiasm for such changes will be increased if a modest appropriation is made to assist in planning for the transition.

SECTION III

Action Alternatives

NASBE Staff Recommendations To State Boards of Education

There appears to be general acceptance among teachers, Board members, parents and administrators that something is lacking in current teacher training programs. Many believe that there is little relationship between quality teaching and a license certifying one to teach. But to change present teacher training programs and the present teacher certification process requires careful cooperation with politically powerful teacher training faculties and even more powerful teacher associations.

Dr. Guthrie has made explicit the current credentialing and training system and the arguments for public control on the one hand and professional control on the other. His alternative, a combined public and professional model, seeks to make a substantial qualitative improvement in teacher training without attracting teacher faculty opposition, and it seeks to change substantially the current credentialing process without attracting the opposition of organized teachers. His model warrants serious discussion.

The obvious options open to a State Board wishing to pursue the Guthrie model are these:

- Ask the state education agency (SEA) staff to prepare an analysis paper outlining the feasibility, problems, benefits and costs associated with the model.
- Appoint a blue-ribbon task force composed of legislators, teachers, administrators, local board members, parents and teacher trainers to analyze the model, inviting them also to make additional recommendations.
- Invite Dr. Guthrie to explain his model fully, asking him to discuss potential implementation problems, cost of implementation and a cost-comparison with existing training programs.
- Assuming that State Boards would want to strengthen their authority over teacher training and licensing, the State Board might consider altering the Guthrie model as follows:

State Teacher Licensing Commission–All proposed regulations would require concurrence of the State Board. The State Board would retain final appeal authority on commission rulings; require an annual report from the commission; and, every three years, contract for an independent audit of the commission's operation and effectiveness with the State Board empowered to implement audit recommendations.

Preservice Teacher Training–The State Board would establish preservice training requirements on recommendation of a blue-ribbon task force composed of teachers, administrators, local board members and teacher trainers; the Board will retain final authority for changing requirements; and would require, every five years, an independent audit assessing the effectiveness of the new preservice teacher training program. Audit results could be forwarded to the reassembled blue-ribbon task force for its analysis and recommendations.

The above do not appear to change the Guthrie model substantially, but obviously leave final authority in the hands of the State Board. □

SECTION IV

Appendix

Footnotes and Annotated Bibliography

[1]Education requirements for certification as a teacher are, at most, one year of graduate training, compared with three or more years for law, medicine and other professions. Also, mean Graduate Record Exam (GRE) aptitude test scores for education majors consistently are lower than for other fields such as the social, physical and natural sciences.

[2]For added information on this topic see James W. Guthrie, Douglas H. Penfield, and David N. Evans, "Geographic Distribution of Teaching Talent," *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 4, November 1969, pp. 645-659.

[3]A recent California study reported public sector employees to be five times less subject to dismissal than private sector workers. (See *Cal-Tax News*, Vol. 17, No. 10, May 15, 1976, p. 1.)

[4]The author is indebted to Charles S. Benson, Roger Hooker, Francis Keppel, and Will Riggan for assistance in the formation of these ideas. Also, portions of this paper owe their origin to ideas suggested by Terry Herndon and Robert Mann in works they and the author produced for the Ohio State Education Department.

[5]Willard Waller, *The Sociology of Teaching* (New York: Wiley, reprinted 1965).

[6]Daniel Lortie, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975). □